

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 4-17, and 19-25 are presently pending. Claims 1, 4-7, 17 and 23 are amended herein. Claims 2, 3, 18, and 26-34 are cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0004] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0005] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Substantive Matters

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0006] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

[0007] Claims 1, 4-17, and 19-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028685 to Smith in view of Priya Lakshminarayanan (*The .NET Schema Object Model*, December 04, 2002, XML.com – O'Reilly Media, Inc.) (hereinafter 'Lakshminarayanan'). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, but in an attempt to advance prosecution, proposes amending the claims in the following manner:

Independent claim 1

[0008] **Independent claim 1** has been amended to recite in pertinent part:

binding elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections using a fourth group of services, wherein the fourth group of services further handle exceptions in data entry;

using a common markup language to map classes and properties specified in the markup language to an instantiated tree of objects across the first group of services, the second group of services [[and]] the third group of services, and the fourth group of services; and

integrating the first group of services, the second group of service services, [[and]] the third group of services, and the fourth group of services using a consistent programming model and consistent services across the three service groups.

[0009] The cited references, namely Smith and 'Lakshminarayanan', do not teach or suggest binding elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections using a fourth group of services, wherein the fourth group of services further handle exceptions in data entry. Support for the proposed amendments can be found at least at page 44, lines 12-22. As the combination of cited art fails to teach or suggest each element of independent claim 1, the combination of Smith and 'Lakshminarayanan' does not render independent claim 1 unpatentable as amended.

[0010] Smith teaches a UI namespace 312 that contains classes which provide web forms server controls **data binding** functionality. (See paragraph [0057]). Smith further teaches a security namespace (or second group of services) that supports the underlying structure of the security system, including interfaces, attributes, **exceptions**, and base classes for permissions. (See paragraph [0075]). Smith fails to teach or suggest a single group of services that provides both binding of elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections and services that handle exceptions in data entry.

[0011] Further, Smith does not teach or suggest a group of services that handles exceptions in data entry. Smith teaches that the security namespace

handles exceptions, but smith is silent as to whether or how it handles exceptions in data entry.

'Lakshminarayanan' is completely silent as to groups of services. The Examiner relies upon 'Lakshminarayanan' to simply teach "using a common markup language to map classes and properties specified in the markup language to an instantiated tree of objects across the first group of services, the second group of services and the third group of services" and "integrating the first group of services, the second group of services and the third group of services using a consistent programming model and consistent services across the three service groups". (Action, page 4). As 'Lakshminarayanan' does not correct the deficiencies of Smith, the combination of cited art does not render claim 1 unpatentable as amended

Dependent Claims 4-16

[0012] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent claim 17

[0013] **Independent claim 17** has been amended to recite in pertinent part:

generating graphical objects using a first group of services;

formatting content using a second group of services;

creating components of the graphical objects using a third group of services;

binding elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections using a fourth group of services, wherein the fourth group of services further handle exceptions in data entry;

wherein the first group of services, the second group of services, the third group of services, and the fourth group of services are integrated via:

sharing a common programming model; and

using a common markup language across the three services to map classes and properties specified in the markup language to an instantiated tree of objects.

[0014] As described in response to the rejection of claim 1, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 17. Namely, the cited art does not show or suggest “binding elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections using a fourth group of services, wherein the fourth group of services further handle exceptions in data entry” as recited in claim 17. Accordingly, the cited art does not support a §103(a) rejection of claim 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 17.

Dependent Claims 19-22

[0015] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 17. As discussed above, claim 17 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent claim 23

[0016] **Independent claim 23** has been amended to recite in pertinent part:

a first group of services for generating graphical objects;

a second group of services for creating components of the graphical objects; and

a third group of services that bind elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections, wherein the third group of services further handle exceptions in data entry;

the first group of services, the second group of services, and the third group of services are integrated by sharing a common programming model, consistent services and using a common markup language to map classes and properties specified in the markup language to an instantiated tree of objects across the first, second, and third group of services.

[0017] As described in response to the rejection of claim 1, the recited art does not show or disclose or suggest the features of claim 23. Namely, the cited art does not show or disclose “a third group of services that bind elements to data sources, data source classes, and data specific implementations of data collections, wherein the third group of services further handle exceptions in data entry” as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, the cited art does not support a §103(a) rejection of claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 23.

Dependent Claims 24 and 25

[0018] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Claim 26-34

[0019] Claims 26-34 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Conclusion

[0020] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2008-04-30

By: /Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/
Jason F. Lindh
Reg. No. 59090
(509) 324-9256 x215
jason@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com